DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 527 EA 014 073

AUTHOR Johnson, Dewayne J.; MacBeth, Jon L.
TITLE Relationship between Faculty and Administrator Perception of Administrator's Role and Degree of Success.
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Physical Education in Higher Education (Milwaukee, WI, June 1-3, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; Department Heads; Higher Education; *Physical Education; *Success; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Based on the view that there is a relationship between faculty and administrator perceptions of administrator role and perceived success of the administrator, this study looked at two correlations: (1) the correlation between faculty perceptions and administrator perceptions of the administrator role and (2) the correlation between faculty perception of the administrator's role and the perceived success of the administrator. Chairpersons and 282 faculty members from 41 U.S. college and university physical education departments were given a 28-item role perception instrument (listing traditional components of an administrator's role) and an 11-item perceived success instrument. Findings indicated no significant relationship between a faculty's perceptions of the administrator's role and the administrator's perception of that role. There was, however, a significant negative relationship between faculty role perception and faculty perception of administrator success: that is, the more traditional the faculty members' perception of administrator role, the less successful they saw their administrator to be. Also, the faculty and administrators disagreed about how successful the department chairperson was. In conclusion, the authors recommend steps to help a faculty feel more positive about their administrator's success: identify faculty perceptions of administrator role, change the administrator's function where feasible, and attempt changes in faculty perception of the administrator role. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED208527

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTION OF ADMINISTRATOR'S ROLE AND DEGREE OF SUCCESS

Dewayne J. Johnson
The Florida State University

Jon L. MacBeth
Middle Tennessee State University

The purpose of this investigation was to study the relationship between the faculty's and the administrator's perception of the administrator's perception of the administrator's role and the degree of success at carrying out that role. Chairpersons and faculty from 41 college and university physical education departments were asked to complete a role perception and perceived success instrument.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Physical Education in Higher Education (Milwaukee, June 1-3, 1979).

EA 014 073

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTION OF ADMINISTRATOR'S ROLE AND DEGREE OF SUCCESS

Roles—how they are perceived by different individuals, and how successfully they are carried out—have not been researched extensively in the field of education (11, 15). Leadership behavior has been studied by numerous researchers (1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 12, 14) who have examined the behavior of the administrator while performing an administrative role or duty. Such qualities as friendship, trust, and ability to communicate are considered in this context. A variety of inventories and scales have been used to identify such behavior (7, 8, 13, 15). These behaviors were then compared by sex, age, experience, etc. This line of research suggests that what an administrator does is not as important as how the administrator behaves in the performance of the duty. However, a second school of thought, much smaller than the leadership behavior school, suggests that the role performed by the administrator is important in its relation to faculty satisfaction.

Previous research has indicated that when faculty and administrator disagree on what the administrator's role is, they will also disagree on how successful the administrator has been at carrying out that role (15). This should not be a surprising revelation; the individual faculty member's perception of what an administrator should be doing would be that faculty member's criterion for determining how successful the administrator is in fulfilling that role. Therefore, congruity of role perception between faculty and administrator is an important determinant of how successfully the faculty perceives the administrator

carrying out his role. When the administrator is viewed as being highly successful by the faculty, attitudes are fostered that contribute to positive interpersonal relations, healthy work environment, and faculty job satisfaction (4, 6, 10, 15).

There appears to be more than a passing relationship between (a) role perception and perception of success and (b) how these perceptions affect the work environment. Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to study the state of congruence among faculty and administrator perception scores and the relationship between faculty perception of administrator's role and perceived success scores.

Methods

Subjects for this study were 41 department chairpersons and 282 faculty members of physical education departments at colleges and universities in the United States. Volunteers were solicited from 250 physical education departments cited by JOHPER as having a graduate program. From the list of volunteers, 50 departments were randomly selected to be surveyed.

Members of each department, chairperson as well as faculty members, were asked to complete three forms: (1) personal data sheet, (2) a 28-item role perception instrument, and (3) an 11-item perceived success instrument. All instruments were mailed to the chairperson for distribution to faculty members. Each subject was provided a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the completed materials to the investigators. All materials were coded to enable the investigators to match all the data from the same school. No names, school or individual, were to appear on the forms.

The role perception and perceived success instruments were constructed and scored following the summative model with a 1-5 Likert scale (1). The

scale for the role perception instrument ran from (1) "definitely should" to (5) "definitely should not" while the scale for the perceived success instrument ran from (1) "very well satisfied" to (5) "very dissatisfied." Each instrument provided a total score that was used in the analysis of the data. The role perception score also provided three sub-scores covering questions related to: (1) promoting effective interpersonal relationships, (2) organizing, planning, and coordinating group work, and (3) conducting staff personnel matters.

Results

Only data from departments from which the investigators received a minimum of five faculty responses were included for data analysis. This stipulation meets the minimum requirements for this type of data collection as set by Halpin (7). In order to determine if a significant difference existed between faculty and administrators on any score, t tests were calculated on each item score on the role perception and perceived success instrument. Because of the additive effect of each item on the sub-scores and the total scores, the Hotellings T^2 was used for the analysis of the vectors within sub-scores and the total scores. Correlation coefficients were calculated between all total scores and sub-scores for faculty and chairpersons.

Correlation coefficients for all sub-scores and total scores are presented in Table 1. There are four sets of coefficients within Table 1 that should be examined. The first set is those scores that are representative of the relationships between faculty and administrator role perception. Results of this study indicated that there was not a significant relationship between role perception of the faculty and administrators. Of the 16 coefficients that represent these relationships, only the coefficient of .30 for faculty and administrator role perception sub-score two (organizing, planning, and

coordinating group work) was significant.

The second set of coefficients that should be examined are those that represent the relationships between sub-scores and total role perception scores. As may be seen in Table 1, both the administrators' and the faculties' sub-scores are significantly related to their total role perception scores. This should be expected, since the sub-scores account for the attitudes represented by the total score.

The third set of scores that are important are the correlation coefficients for the relationship between faculty scores for role perception and perception of administrator success. These are the four coefficients at the right on the bottom roll in Table 1. As may be seen, there is a negative relationship between faculty role perception and perception of success, with two coefficients being significant at the .001 level. The role perception instrument concerned itself with duties that are normally considered in the literature as the duties and function of the department administrator, regardless of discipline. The negative correlations would indicate that the more the faculty perceived the administrator's role being congruent with guidelines established in professional literature, the less successful the administrator was perceived. The reciprocal would also be true; the fewer of the responsibilities the faculty felt the administrator should be performing, the more successful those faculty perceived their administrator. This relationship may indicate that administrators in general are not performing many of the duties that are generally associated with their position. Depending on the perception of each administrator's faculty, some administrators will be perceived as successful while other administrators will be perceived as less successful.

The last correlation coefficient that should be looked at is the one that

represents the relationship between faculty and administrator perceived success score. As may be seen, a significant relationship existed between the two sets of scores, although not extremely high. Although the faculty's perceived success score is significantly related to faculty role perception scores and administrator's perceived success score, the administrator's score is not related to the role perception score of either faculty or administrator. This would suggest that only the faculty, and not the administrator, uses role expectations as a criterion for evaluation of competency of the departmental administrator.

This study did not establish a relationship between faculty and administrator role perception. According to the literature, the lack of agreement in role expectations will result in a lack of agreement on the degree of success achieved at performing the expected duty. The lack of a significant correlation does not provide a complete answer to that theory. Therefore, to further evaluate the effect of faculty and administrator role perception on perceived success, t tests were calculated on each item score with the Hotellings T^2 used to analyze the sub-scores and total scores.

It may be seen that two of the role perception sub-scores—organizing, planning, and coordinating group work, and conducting staff personnel matters—were significantly different. The total role perception score was significant at the .07 level; therefore, those scores will not be considered different in this study. However, with two of the sub-scores different, some consideration should be given to the high probability of the total score.

The ultimate question is whether the faculty and administrators agree or disagree on the success of the department chairperson. It may be seen in Table 2 that perceived success scores of the faculty and the administrators are significantly different. When looking at the item analysis for the

perceived success instrument, there are significant differences in faculty and administrator scores on six of the eleven items. The results on the analysis of the perceived success instrument clearly indicated a difference in opinion about how successful the department chairperson has been.

Results of this study indicate that faculty perception of administrator's role is extremely important to faculty evaluation of the administrator. The lack of congruity in role perception between administrator and faculty has an interrelated effect on the differences that exist between the faculty's and administrator's perception of the degree of success of the administrator. Based on these conclusions, the investigators would recommend that administrators identify their faculty members' perceptions of the administrative role. Once they have done this, the department chairpersons have three alternatives: change the faculty's perception of the administrator's role, alter administrative functioning to reflect faculty's perceptions, or a combination of these two. The investigators would recommend the third alternative, that of changing the administrative functioning when feasible, influencing changes in faculty's perception when possible, and negotiating differences when necessary. This approach would appear to be the course of action that would most significantly alter faculty's perception of administrator's success in a positive direction.

TABLE 1

CORRELATION MATRIX FOR THE COMPARISON OF ROLE PERCEPTION AND PERCEIVED SUCCESS SCORES

FACTORS	A-29	A-30	A-31	A-TR	A-JS	F-29	F-30	F-31	F-TR	F-JS
A ROLE 29	1.00									
A ROLE 30	.22	1.00								
A ROLE 31	.21	.11	1.00							
A TOT ROLE	.61*	.55*	.81*	1.00						
A JOB SAT	-.11	.08	-.03	-.03	1.00					
F ROLE 29	.04	.08	-.08	-.01	.03	1.00				
F ROLE 30	.17	.30*	-.08	.13	.08	.48*	1.00			
F ROLE 31	-.07	.17	.06	.08	.06	.20	.40*	1.00		
F TOT ROLE	.07	.21	-.08	.08	.06	.64*	.76*	.81*	1.00	
F JOB SAT	-.05	.12	.18	.15	.34*	-.19	-.39*	-.21	-.36*	1.00

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF MEANS

FOR ALL SCORES

SCORE	FACULTY MEANS	ADMIN MEANS	F RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE
Total Role Score	57.35	55.66	1.62	.07
Role Sub-Score One	16.38	16.05	0.59	.76
Role Sub-Score Two	14.59	14.51	2.25	.04*
Role Sub-Score Three	26.38	25.10	1.82	.05*
Perceived Success	22.97	19.85	10.68	.001*

REFERENCES

1. Allen, P. "An Investigation of Administrative Leadership and Group Interaction in Departments of Physical Education for Women of Selected Colleges and Universities." Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1973.

2. Buckiewicz, D. R. "An Analysis of Leader Behavior in the Physical Education Departments of the Community Colleges of California, Oregon, and Washington." Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1974.

3. Carlson, G. P. "Perceptions of Physical Education Chairmen as Leaders." Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1973.

4. Carroll, A. B. "The Role Conflict Phenomenon: Implications for Department Chairmen and Academic Faculty." Improving College and University Teaching, 24: 245-46, 1976.

5. Christensen, C. E.; Milner, K.; and Christensen, J. E. "An Analysis of Faculty Perceptions of Leadership Qualities of Male and Female Physical Education Departments." Research Quarterly, 49: 269-77, 1978.

6. Evans, M. G. "Leadership and Motivation: A Core Concept." Academy of Management Journal, 3: 91-102, 1970.

7. Halpin, A. W. Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1957.

8. Hemphill, J. K., and Coons, A. E. "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." In R. M. Stodgill and A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1957.

9. Longstreth, C. A. "An Analysis of the Perceptions of the Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Secondary School Principals in Florida." Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1973.

10. Martin, C. R. "Support for Women's Lib: Management Performance." The Southern Journal of Business, 7: 19-28, 1972.

11. Milner, E. K. "A Comparative Study of Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Heads of Departments of Physical Education in Major Universities and Colleges." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1976.

12. Milner, E. K., and Tetu, Robert G., Jr. "Leadership Behavior." Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, 50 (5): 22-24, 1979.

13. Stogdill, R. M., and Shartle, C. L. Methods in the Study of Administrative Leadership. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Monograph No. 88, 1957.

14. Van Meir, E. J. "Leadership Behavior of Male and Female Elementary Principals: A Comparison by Sex." Marquette University, Education Review, 4: 7-11, 1973.

15. Wood, S. J. "Reciprocal Role Expectations of Women Physical Education Teachers and Chairmen." Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1971.